

IN THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RECEIVED

SEP 28 2020

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

CASE NUMBER: 20-CR-147 (PAMY/LIB)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent,

v.

Agustus Q. Light,

Defendant.

SUPPLEMENTAL  
PRO SE MOTION TO  
SUPPRESS ALL EVIDENCE  
OBTAINED THROUGH, GPS,  
ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE,  
LOCATION, TRACKING DEVICE,  
ECT., IN VIOLATION OF TITLE III,  
18 U.S.C.S. § 2518(10)(a)(i)(ii)(iii); § 2516(2)  
AND THE FOURTH AMENDMENT.

Memorandum of Law, and Affidavit.

1.) THAT IN FACT and at LAW, Defendant, Agustus Q. Light, Pro Se, respectfully  
Moves this Court to state that the Eighth Circuit has firmly held and stated  
that "We have consistently held that evidence obtained in violation of a state law  
is admissible in a federal Criminal Trial if the evidence was obtained without  
violating the Constitution or Federal Law. See United States v. Olderbak, 961 F.2d 756, 760  
(8th Cir. 1992).

2.) THAT IN FACT and at LAW, When Beltrami County Sheriff officer David Hart  
Made the "APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT" For a Warrant Authorizing the Electronic  
Surveillance interception which violated the Minnesota Privacy of Communications  
Act, Minnesota Statute § 626A.05, which required that Applications For interceptions be  
initiated by either the Attorney General or by a County Attorney, And the Federal Statute  
18 U.S.C.S. § 2516(2) required "the principle prosecuting Attorney" Make the application; He violated  
the Federal Law, U.S. Constitution and State Law.

SCANNED  
CK  
SEP 28 2020

3.) THAT IN FACT and at LAW, Beltrami County Sheriff Officer David Hart is Not a "Principle Prosecuting Attorney" for 18 U.S.C.S. § 2516(2) purposes, Nor is he an "Attorney General" or "County Attorney" For Minn. Stat. 626A.05 purposes, NEVER WAS, NEVER HAS BEEN, NOT only did Dave Hart Make "APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT" himself, he Authorized himself to bypass the LAW that Congress enacted "to Make Application himself, to a Judge of his choice, For an "ORDER Approving Electronic Surveillance in violation of 18 U.S.C.S. § 2516(2).

4.) THAT IN FACT and at LAW, For the reasons stated Above All Evidence Obtained through Electronic Surveillance on Mr. Lights cell phone and Vehicle should be suppressed because the "AFFIDAVIT AND APPLICATION" are insufficient on its face in violation of 18 U.S.C.S. § 2518 (10)(a)(i)(ii)(iii) and Beltrami County Sheriff Officer David Hart Dishonestly and Recklessly Misled the Judge into believing he was the person Eligible to Make "Application and Affidavit" For Electronic Surveillance Warrant, "FRANKS HEARING REQUESTED" pursuant to, Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 159, 171-72 (1978). GOOD FAITH EXCEPTION DOES NOT APPLY.

I, Agustus Q. Light, declare under penalty of Perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

EXECUTED ON September 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2020

S/ Agustus Q. Light  
AGUSTUS Q. LIGHT